Remarks

Prior to addressing the merits of the case, we respectfully note that this application and its parent application have been pending for five and a half years. In the parent application, over a year had passed between the Office Action issued by the previously assigned Examiner and the Office Action issued by the currently assigned Examiner simultaneously with the first Office Action in the instant application. Much of that time (albeit not all) was due to an apparent misunderstanding of Patent Office practice and the patent laws by the prior Examiner and an apparent lack of responsiveness by that Examiner to attempts by the undersigned to discuss the case with the Examiner.

For this reason, we respectfully request the Examiner very carefully consider the remarks contained in this response and respectfully request that the Examiner, and/or the Examiner's supervisor if need be, contact the undersigned at her earliest possible convenience in an effort to avoid any unnecessary delay in the prosecution of this application.

The rejections under 35 USC 102(a) and 103(a).

Turning first to the substantive rejections, we respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the solicited claims under 35 USC 102(a) and 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nadkarni (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,659), or Nadkarni in view of Haq et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,812).

First, we respectfully submit that Nadkarni neither anticipates the claims nor renders them obvious. For example, we first respectfully note that Nadkarni does not include the fundamental feature of all of the solicited claims of assigning an Intellectual Capital code to each of the assigned skills. Nadkarni, as shown in Figure 5(a)-(c), inputs information using common word descriptions for each entry in a category. As Nadkarni states in C2:L45-52:

> "Standardization is achieved through the use of system prompts directed to both the candidates when populating the database and the employers when formulating a search query. This ensures that both the candidate and the employer will use the same **terminology**, thus preventing the spelling, spacing, case, and most importantly, the language of the database from being an issue in the search. Therefore, accuracy and efficiency in selecting data to satisfy a query is facilitated." [emphasis added.]

All Nadkarni does is use forms that are populated with commonly used terminology that only allows the user to select a term from that list. While Nadkarni assigns these various skills to various categories in this manner, he does not code them as in the claimed invention. A reading of the Applicants' Specification (and the previously submitted iCap standard for that matter) illustrates the clear difference between simply using standardized terminology for various skills and creating an Intellectual Capital code. Moreover, the plainly different meanings of the terms "code" and "terminology" make this difference clear.

During examination, the terms of a claim must be given their broadest possible scope, but this scope must be consistent with the plain meaning of that term as understood by those of skill in the art and the consistent with the Applicants' Specification.

As shown in the attached Web page from Merriam-Webster, terminology is merely "the technical or special terms used in a business, art, science, or special subject." And that is exactly what is shown in Nadkarni. In sharp contrast, Applicants' are assigning a ***code*** to each of the assigned skills. In this context the most applicable plain meaning of code is "a: a system of signals or symbols for communication b: a system of symbols (as letters or numbers) used to represent assigned and often secret meanings." (See second attached Web page from Merriam-Webster).

The point is that the claimed invention uses a system of assigned symbols (albeit not limited to the illustrated embodiment); it does not just use standardized terminology. This difference can be seen in the Specification in the illustrations of how the user inputs information on the skill and how the system can be used to create an Intellectual Capital code for a skill.

Another patentably distinct aspect of the claimed invention is that all of the solicited claims include the feature of adding at least one weighting factor to at least one of the Intellectual Capital codes, wherein the weighting factor represents experience in the skills represented by the Intellectual Capital codes.

The Examiner appears to be equating mere data of the length-of-time field of Nadkarni with the weighting factor of the claimed invention. However, we respectfully note that they are entirely different.

In Nadkarni, "a length-of-time field exists for each skill/category and allows for the summation of time-per-skill across various stretches of employment. In other words, the system can quantify length of experience for a particular skill over discontinuous periods of time. This feature is extremely beneficial since overall experience, not continuous experience, is of primary concern to most employers." (C2:L60-65.)

This is not a weighting factor, however, but merely a piece of data representing the length of time that an individual has spent working on a given skill. In other words, there is no mechanism in Nadkarni for ***weighting*** this value (i.e., representing the importance of this length-of-time in relation to the other skills so that it can be used by the system for a comparison of those skills. It is not the length-of-time value itself that is important, but how it is weighted in relation to other skills. Again turning to Merriam-Webster, the most applicable plain meaning of the claimed weighting factor is "a : the relative importance or authority accorded something b : measurable influence especially on others." (See attached Web page.)

In sharp contrast to Nadkarni, in the claimed invention, a weighting factor is included in the Intellectual Capital code for a skill, which allows the Intellectual Capital code to be used to match and rank the individuals skills. This is nowhere disclosed, taught or suggested in Nadkarni and is not possible with his mere system of standardized terminology and stored raw data.

While the claimed weighting factor is based upon the experience in the skill, experience in the skill is not the weighting factor itself. In this regard, we also note that experience does not have to be length-of-time only. Length-of-time is only one aspect of experience. Other aspects may include when the skill was last used, whether the individual can or can't use some aspect of the skill, etc. To be a weighting factor by definition, the individual's experience in this skill must also have a value that allows it to be compared it to another individual's experience in a skill.

This patentably distinct aspect of the claimed invention is discussed at length in the Specification:

> "[0031] In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, the weighting factor is limited to five values, with Years Used and Last Used being used with all defined skills. This would allow for three other, configurable weighting values for each defined skill, to be based, for example, on what an employer would want to know about a skill. In conjunction with this, a total of nine digits are preferably used for the weighting factor. The Last Used would occupy four digits, and the Years Used would occupy two digits.
>
> [0032] The remainder of the weighting factors may use single On/Off values. For example, either an individual can Use and/or Configure Outlook 2000 or they cannot. There would be no degrees of ability such as Beginner/Intermediate/Advanced, since that would be far too subjective and not useful for measurement.
>
> [0033] If less than three weighting values are used (in addition to the Last Used and the Years Used), then the missing values may be represented in the data source by a 0 value. Visually this may be represented by an underscore (_), just like lack of that measurement would be. The provides the advantage that a uniform defined length of the Intellectual Capital code can be maintained, to ensure compatibility with numerous other processes and technology.
>
> [0034] Thus, for example, an individual may have the particular defined skill shown in Table 5, and the following experience: Years Used: 5; Last Used: 1999; Use: Yes; and Configure: Yes The resulting weighted Intellectual Capital code for the defined skill might look like: "01-04-01-001-001:199905/UC_". Those of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate, of course, that the defined skill related information is not necessarily stored in the data source in this fashion, but that it is merely presented this way for readability purposes. This skill could be verbalized as "Joe has used and configured Microsoft Windows 95/98 for 5 years until 1999."

Simply storing the total length-of-time at a skill as in Nadkarni does not accomplish this. For example, in conducting a search using the system of Nadkarni, there is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of ranking (weighting) the skill sets of various individuals based on their experience. There is no teaching of how the piece of data of length-of-time is a weighting factor that assigns importance to that skill in relation to others. In sharp contrast, the significance of the claimed weighting factor is clearly illustrated in the Applicants' Specification:

"[0055] Then a comparison or match of the skills inventory of various individuals with the position requirement set will reveal the number of matching skills. The matching system of the present invention may also use the weighting factor to allow, for example, early disqualification of candidates for a specific job, and allow zeroing in on properly qualified candidates based upon the candidate's skills inventory as compared with the position skills requirement. The results can then be displayed by various means well known to those skilled in the art to the user, based on the weighting or other criteria.

[0056] Thus, once an employer has created the skills requirement set for a position, that employer can then perform a match against the skills inventory of any available individuals to determine if those individuals meet the employer's requirements.

[0057] ***The present invention provides the distinct advantage that it significantly reduces the time it takes to determine a match, without eliminating important subjective decision making. For example, an employer can determine that though an individual can currently only Use a skill, the employer can teach him to Configure as well, since he at least knows the skill. In other words, the present invention matches and presents the individual's skills inventory in a manner that still allows the employer to make subjective determinations.***

[0058] In the preferred embodiment, the matching process works by first matching the base Intellectual Capital codes (i.e., devoid of weighting factors and other additional values). When these Codes match, the system may then evaluate the Skill Bind needs of the position requirement set to the Skill Bind associations of the individual's skills inventory.

[0059] If a particular skill in the individual's skills inventory is not Skill Bound, but is Skill Bound in the position requirement set, then it is preferred that the weighted value of that Skill be reduced by 50% in the comparison. This is based on the understanding that the intentional binding of skills in the position requirement set is highly important, yet allows for a subjective decision to still be made by the employer, by including the individual's skills in the result set.

[0060] Next, the various weighting factors may also be compared. For example, skills weighted with the MUST value in the position requirement set are separated from the PLUS weighted skills. Thereafter there may be two sets of comparisons based upon these weighting values.

[0061] In these comparisons, the ANY value is exclusive of the MUST and PLUS. Thus, if the individual's skills inventory contains a skill identified in the position requirement set with the ANY value, then it is treated as a MUST. If no ANY valued Skills are matched, then the comparison will reflect a 100% loss for that skill. In other words, if the position requirement set contains four skills containing the MUST value and four containing the ANY value, and the skill inventory for that individual has all four of the MUST skills, but none of the ANY then the actual match would be a 80%.

[0062] In addition, if a particular skill does not contain an On / Off weighting value that is specified by that skill in the position requirement set, then the weighting of the resulting comparison may also be reduced by some amount, for example, 10%.

[0063] In another matching scenario, if the skill in the individual's skills inventory is valued at one year less in Years Used (or Last Used) than the same skill in the position requirement set, the value of that comparison may be reduced, preferably from 1% to 10%. If the year is one year greater, the value may be increased by a similar amount. This increase in value may also be limited to situations when the skill in the position requirement set fully matches the On/Off values associated with that skill in the individual's skill inventory.

[0064] Finally, if any skill yields a matching value of less than 90% in a comparison, then the matching value percentage won't reflect any bonuses. In other words, unless an individual's skills match all of the position requirements, no bonuses will be applied to the comparison of the particular skills.

[0065] All of the matching individual skills inventories are then sorted by the value of the comparison percentages for the skills contained in each. This is preferably sorted on the MUST value match percentage first, and then the PLUS matching percentage, although not limited thereto.

[0117] Upon finding prospective job seekers, the user will be able to compare side by side the skills that match and the relationship of the measurements of each skill, e.g. greater or less than the requirements. The user will also be shown the skills that the job seeker lacks and the skills that the job seeker has that the job doesn't require. The user will also be able to view other non- skill related comparisons such as relocation, travel, etc.

[0118] ***Some of the many significant uses of the present invention, which are not capable with the systems of the prior art, are, matching jobs, measuring the Intellectual Capital value of a business, and evaluating training needs. It will also be appreciated to one skilled in the art that the system of the present invention could easily be utilized in a number of additional areas.***" [Emphasis added.]

The solicited claims include the above-discussed and other various features not disclosed, taught, or suggested in Nadkarni. Accordingly, we respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

We similarly traverse the rejections under 103(a) over Nadkarni in light of Haq et al. As discussed above, Nadkarni fails to disclose, teach, or suggest fundamental aspects of the claimed invention. Haq fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Nadkarni and their hypothetical combination still does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, we respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The provisional double patenting rejection.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-7, 9-21, 23-29, 31-51, and 53-65 over several claims of Applicant's co-pending application 09/549,079 in view of Nadkami (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,659) – and likewise the claims of that application over the claims of this one. Without acknowledgement of the basis of the rejection, Applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer since this is the later filed application. Accordingly, we respectfully request that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection based upon 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

We respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 23-44 under the first paragraph of 35 USC 112. The Examiner's concern with the claimed "data source" is not entirely understood, since one clear example of a data source (indeed the example discussed at length in the Specification) is a relational database. As expressly stated in the Specification in paragraph [0039] "The data source of the present

invention may comprise any number of data sources well known to those of skill in the art, such as relational databases or linked files."

We respectfully note that whether or not this data source is a "device," does not appear to be relevant to the issue of enablement, and appears to be more part of the Examiner's concern under 35 USC 101 – addressed in more detail in the next section. As set forth in MPEP Section 2164.01, the test for enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation (bearing in mind that a patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art).

As further stated in MPEP 2106(B)(2), the specification should disclose how to configure a computer to possess the requisite functionality or how to integrate the programmed computer with other elements of the invention, **unless a skilled artisan would know how to do so without such disclosure**. See, e.g., Dossel, 115 F.3d at 946-47, 42 USPQ2d at 1884-85; Northern Telecom v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 941-43, 15 USPQ2d 1321, 1328-30 (Fed. Cir.1990) (judgment of invalidity reversed for clear error where expert testimony on both sides showed that a programmer of reasonable skill could write a satisfactory program with ordinary effort based on the disclosure); DeGeorge v. Bernier, 768 F.2d 1318, 1324, 226 USPQ 758, 762-63 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (superseded by statute with respect to issues not relevant here) (invention was adequately disclosed for purposes of enablement even though all of the circuitry of a word processor was not disclosed, since the undisclosed circuitry was deemed inconsequential because it did not pertain to the claimed circuit); In re Phillips, 608 F.2d 879, 882-83, 203 USPQ 971, 975 (CCPA 1979) (computerized method of generating printed architectural specifications dependent on use of glossary of predefined standard phrases and error-checking feature enabled by overall disclosure generally defining errors); In re Donohue, 550 F.2d 1269, 1271, 193 USPQ 136, 137 (CCPA 1977) ("Employment of block diagrams and descriptions of their functions is not fatal under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, providing the represented structure is conventional and can be determined without undue experimentation."); In re Knowlton, 481 F.2d 1357, 1366-68, 178 USPQ 486, 493-94 (CCPA 1973) (examiner's contention that a software invention needed a detailed description of all the circuitry in the complete hardware system reversed).

All of the aspects of the claimed data source are discussed in great detail in the embodiments of the invention disclosed in the Specification. The Specification discloses numerous examples of Intellectual Capital codes, a hierarchical list of Intellectual Capital categories, assigned codes to individual skills, and various weighting factors.

The Specification also recites specific database applications, CGI, and/or API that may be used. See, e.g., paragraphs [0125] and [0126]. The Specification also discloses numerous forms and templates that may be used. See, e.g., Figures 2(a)-(e), Figures 3(a)-(e), and Tables 1-5, and associated text. The

Specification also goes into great detail regarding a matching process using the claimed invention. See, e.g., paragraphs [0058] – [0118].

One of ordinary skill is art is well aware of how to implement these claimed features in a relational database and associated software. As noted above, the MPEP makes clear that a patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art. Thus, section 112 does not require for the Specification to describe in painstaking detail an example of an exact programming code and data schema that may be used to implement the claimed data source, since it would be straightforward for a software programmer of ordinary skill to accomplish this once they had the teachings of the invention laid out in the Specification. By way of comparison, we note that the instant Specification provides much greater detail on how to structure a database than even the Nadkarni reference cited by the Examiner.

We also respectfully note that while the disclosed database, CGI, and API applications are one form of data source, the claims do not need to be limited to these embodiments to be enabling, nor must the Specification disclose every possible embodiment. As set forth in MPEP 2164, as long as the specification discloses at least one method for making and using the claimed invention that bears a reasonable correlation to the entire scope of the claim, then the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112 is satisfied. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). Failure to disclose other methods by which the claimed invention may be made does not render a claim invalid under 35 U.S.C. 112. Spectra-Physics, Inc. v. Coherent, Inc., 827 F.2d 1524, 1533, 3 USPQ2d 1737, 1743 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 954 (1987).

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the rejection under 35 USC 112 be withdrawn.

The rejection based upon 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

We respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 38-40 under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112. Claims 38-40 have been amended to recite a "communication component" and a "scheduling component." As these terms are well understood to those in the computer arts, they may include any combination of hardware, software, and/or firmware capable of performing the function of communicating or scheduling in the manner recited in the claim. One example of a communication component used in the embodiment disclosed in the Specification (although the claims are not limited thereto) is an email server. An example of a scheduling component may be software incorporated into the Web server used for coordinating the interview process.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection based upon 35 USC 101.

We respectfully traverse the rejection of the solicited claims under 35 USC 101.

In regard to **claims 1-22**, we first respectfully note that the Examiner admits that the recited claims produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result (Official Action, page 5), e.g., cataloging the Intellectual Capital of individuals by assigning the individual's skills to Intellectual Capital categories; assigning an Intellectual Capital code to each of the assigned skills; and adding at least one weighting factor to at least one of the Intellectual Capital code.

As has been well established by the Federal Circuit, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, and the Commissioner, this is all that is needed for the claimed process to constitute statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101; and it is wholly improper to attempt to impose a further requirement that the claims also be limited to implementation in a computer or equivalent. See, Ex Parte Carl A. Lundgren, Appeal No. 2003-2088, heard April 20, 2004, Application 08/093,516, AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc., 172 F.3d 1352, 1358, 50 USPQ2d 1447, 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1999), and "Examination Guidelines for Computer-Related Inventions" MPEP 2106.

The Examiner seems to be relying on the inappropriate "technological arts" test for the incorrect proposition that the claimed method is merely an abstract idea unless it recites a structural interrelationship with a computer. We respectfully note that such a test was expressly rejected by the Board in *Ex Parte Lundgren* – and this decision is binding on the Office. We also note that the Board in *Lundgren* expressly rejected *Ex Parte Bowman* (relied upon here by the Examiner) because it was a non-binding decision – limited to its circumstances. The Board in *Lundgren* noted the Federal Circuit's decision in *AT&T v. Excel Comm.*, which indicated that the claimed process must only produce a concrete result to be statutory.

Lundgren is particularly relevant to the instant application because the claims at issue in that case also involved a specific business process, not tied to any computer, that produced a concrete result – as with the instant claims. We respectfully request that the Examiner carefully review the *Lundgren* decision and the claims at issue therein to see that they did not require an interrelationship with a computer.

In short, there is no separate "technological arts" test for determining whether the claimed invention is statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101, and no requirement that the claims be tied to a computer. The proper test is whether the claimed process is merely an abstract idea **or** produces a concrete result. MPEP 2106(A). The fact that the claimed process in this case produces a useful, tangible, and concrete result (as noted by the Examiner) precludes it from being an abstract idea, as illustrated by the Federal Circuit in the *AT&T* decision, made clear by the Board in *Lundgren*, and set forth in MPEP 2106. We respectfully note that whether it may or may not be implemented within the mind is not the issue.

Accordingly we respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In regard to **claims 23-44**, the Examiner has rejected these claims as non-statutory because "the applicant is claiming an apparatus without its structural parts needed to realize the apparatus' functionality." This appears to be tied to the Examiner's contention noted in connection with the rejection under 35 USC 112 that the claimed data source is not a "device." The Examiner does not provide any further explanation than this, nor does she cite any legal authority to support this as a valid basis for a rejection under section 101. However, it appears that the Examiner's contention is that the solicited claims are not statutory subject matter because they are not a properly claimed machine or article of manufacture. We respectfully disagree.

As noted in MPEP 2106, if a claim defines a useful machine or manufacture by identifying the physical structure of the machine or manufacture in terms of its hardware or hardware and software combination, it defines a statutory product. See, e.g., Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583, 32 USPQ2d at 1034-35; Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361-62, 31 USPQ2d at 1760.

The claimed data source is in fact a statutory product and is not non-statutory non-functional descriptive material (as seems to be the Examiner's suggestion). The claimed apparatus clearly includes a hardware component, as well as functional software components that are "capable of causing functional change in the computer." MPEP 2106(IV)(B)(1)(a). A claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure that defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized is statutory.

As set forth in MPEP 2106(IV)(B)(1), when functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it **becomes** structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). The Specification is replete with examples of how each of the functional elements of claim 23 may be incorporated into hardware and software, such as in using the described Web server and database system.

Thus, the recited claims clearly set forth the general structure of the claimed computer related product having expressly recited functional elements embodied in a computer-readable medium. The patent laws do not require that the claimed invention be limited to one described embodiment.

Accordingly we respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In regard to claims **45-66**, the Examiner has rejected these claims as non-statutory because "the applicant is claiming a computer program without the computer and/or machine and its structural interrelationship needed to realize the computer readable medium's functionality." The Examiner does not provide any further explanation than this, nor does she cite any legal authority to support this as a valid basis for a rejection under section 101.

Claim 45 expressly recites numerous functional steps, e.g., establishing a hierarchical list of Intellectual Capital categories; assigning skills to the Intellectual Capital categories; assigning an Intellectual Capital code to each of the assigned skills; and adding at least one weighting factor. Thus, at least a portion of any descriptive material in the claim is functional. Claim 45 also now expressly recites that this functional data structure is embodied on a computer-readable medium ("A computer-accessible medium containing computer program for cataloging the Intellectual Capital of individuals, said individuals having individual skills, said computer program being embodied on at least one physical media").

As discussed at length above in regard to the other claims, it is not necessary for the claims to recite an interrelationship with a computer to be statutory subject matter. The claims need only define the structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized.

As set forth in MPEP 2106(IV)(B)(1), when functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it **becomes** structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

This the instant claims are clearly along the lines of *In re Lowry*, and thus statutory subject matter. Accordingly we respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Because the requirements of 35 USC 101 are satisfied by the solicited claims, we respectfully request that the rejection under 35 USC 101 be withdrawn.

The claim objection.

Claim 40 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

We respectfully submit that the solicited claims are patentable over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank A. Cona
Reg. No. 38,412
Phone: (561) 632-0013
Date: **February 7, 2006**

OIPE
FEB 13 2006
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Merriam-Webster OnLine
Merriam-Webster
Merriam-Webster ONLINE | Merriam-Webster COLLEGIATE | Merriam-Webster UNA | Merriam-Webster for KIDS | Encyclopedia BRITANNICA

Medical Terminology
Made Incredibly Easy! 2nd Ed. Published in May 2004
www.lww.com

Medical Terminology
Improve Your Resume and Experience Learn Medical Terminology Today!
www.corexcel.com/

HOME
PREMIUM SERVICES
M-WCollegiate.com
M-WUnabridged.com
Britannica.com
Multi-User Licenses
DOWNLOADS
WORD OF THE DAY
WORD GAMES
WORD FOR THE WISE
ONLINE STORE
HELP

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary

Thesaurus

terminology

One entry found for **terminology**.

Main Entry: **ter·mi·nol·o·gy**
Pronunciation: `"t&r-m&-'nä-l&-jE`
Function: *noun*
Inflected Form(s): *plural* **-gies**
Etymology: Medieval Latin *terminus* term, expression (from Latin, boundary, limit) + English *-o-* + *-logy*
1 : the technical or special terms used in a business, art, science, or special subject
2 : nomenclature as a field of study
- ter·mi·no·log·i·cal /-m&-n&l-'ä-ji-k&l/ *adjective*
- ter·mi·no·log·i·cal·ly /-ji-k(&-)lE/ *adverb*

For **More Information on "terminology" go to Britannica.com**

Get the **Top 10 Search Results for "terminology"**

Ads by Google

Learn Med. Terminology
Study Medical Terminology Online Or at Home Nationally Accredited!
www.MedTermCourse.com

Medical Terminology
Online training course - easy to understand. Start today.
votectraining.com

Earn Your Degree Online
Earn a Degree in Business, IT, Law, Health. Request More Information!
www.CollegeandUniversity.net

Ac
Merriam-Webste
Dictionary
Thesaurus

Browse by letter
A B C D E F G H I
N O P Q R S T U V

Browse words n
terminology

terminology

Babylon-Pro
Get instant results
Merriam-Webster i
desktop applicatio
single click
Merriam-Webs
Babylon-Pro

Handheld Collegiate
Now you can take
Eleventh Edition w
anywhere as Franl
new Speaking Elec
Handheld!
Franklin.com/

Merriam-Wel
Collegiat
14-day Free

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

I want a
Bachelor's degree in ...

Criminal Justice Administration

Submit

I want a
Master's degree in ...

Business Administration

Submit

Pronunciation Symbols

© 2005-2006 Merriam-Webster, Incorporated

FEB 13 2006



Coverity
IDC: Coverity Leading Static Tool Register For a Free Trial
www.coverity.com

Code generator
Build the Next Wave of Enterprise Applications Without Complexity.
www.LANSA.com

Barcode Inventory System
Affordable and customized barcode inventory management/reporting sw
www.asapsystems.com

Fortify Your Soft
Protect against secu risk from flawed soft
www.fortifysoftware.c

HOME
PREMIUM SERVICES
M-WCollegiate.com
M-WUnabridged.com
Britannica.com
Multi-User Licenses
DOWNLOADS
WORD OF THE DAY
WORD GAMES
WORD FOR THE WISE
ONLINE STORE
HELP

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary

Thesaurus

code

16 entries found for **code**. The first 10 are listed below.
To select an entry, click on it. For more results, click here.

code[1,noun]
code[2,verb]
area code
bar code
code name
code word

Go

Main Entry: **[1]code**
Pronunciation: 'kOd
Function: *noun*
Etymology: Middle English, from Middle French, from Latin *caudex, codex* trunk of a tree, document formed originally from wooden tablets
1 : a systematic statement of a body of law; *especially* **:** one given statutory force
2 : a system of principles or rules <moral *code*>
3 a : a system of signals or symbols for communication **b :** a system of symbols (as letters or numbers) used to represent assigned and often secret meanings
4 : GENETIC CODE
5 : a set of instructions for a computer
- code·less /-l&s/ *adjective*

For **More Information on "code" go to Britannica.com**
Get the **Top 10 Search Results for "code"**

Ads by Google

XML Code Generator
Generate C#, C++, Java & XSLT code for Data Integration Apps. Try free

Ad
Merriam-Webste
Dictionary
Thesaurus

Browse by letter
A B C D E F G H I
N O P Q R S T U V
Browse words n
code

code

Babylon-Pro
Get instant results
Merriam-Webster i
desktop applicatio
single click
Merriam-Webs
Babylon-Pro

Handheld Collegiate
Now you can take
Eleventh Edition w
anywhere as Franl
new Speaking Elec
Handheld!
Franklin.com/

Merriam-Wel
Collegiat
14-day Free

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

www.Altova.com

Fortify Your Software
Protect against security risk from flawed software.
www.fortifysoftware.com

Java Code Generation
Data Persistence for JDBC DAO EJB CMP, JDO, Hibernate
www.codefutures.com

I want a
Bachelor's degree in ...

Criminal Justice Administration

Submit

I want a
Master's degree in ...

Business Administration

Submit

Pronunciation Symbols

© 2005-2006 Merriam-Webster, Incorporated